

DETAILED ACTION

This is in reference to response received on 12 November 2007. Addition of claims 161 – 163 is acknowledged. Claims 98 – 100 and 102 – 163 are pending for examination.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's argument that a limitation of claim 98 is that the communication received from the tenant is associated with a task performed by an individual associated with the front gate/desk of the building. Nothing in the Aihara reference suggests or gives any incentive to the association of an instruction from a tenant with a task performed by management.

However, applicant's argument is for the data contained in the instruction.

In response to applicant's argument that applicant should be granted patent because of their commercial success of installation of products in about 225 buildings Nationwide.

However, 225 buildings Nationwide is considered small installation in comparison to number of buildings with concierge services nationwide. This clearly shows that applicant's invention is not the only product commercially available nationwide

Applicant's other arguments and concerns are responded to in response to pending claims in this office action.

Priority

Applicant's claim of an earlier priority date with the filing of declaration will not be considered because newly added claims add limitation which are not supported by Exhibit A filed with the Declaration received by the office on 02 February 2005. For example:

Claims 119, 120 and 158, recite limitation of biometric data for secure remote verification of users.

Claim 121 recite the limitation providing aggregated data for said first building and a second building.

Claim 132 recite the limitation permitting access to information stored on said central computer based on a type of user.

Claim 136, recite the limitation associating an electronic document in said electronic library with an expiration date.

Claim 142 and 152, recite the limitation transmitting said notification in response to said electronic document being added to said electronic library.

Claim 143, recite the limitation transmitting said notification in response to said electronic document being updated.

Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claims 161 – 163 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons.

- I. Claims 98 – 100 and 102 – 160 are directed to exchanging information among tenants and an individual associated with the management of a building.
- II. claims 161 – 162 are directed to method for managing deliveries to and from occupants of a building; Task of deliveries and receiving are done based on rules associated with respective task; Processing of payment is done when services of delivery or receiving is rendered.
- III. claim 163 is directed to managing a building related task that is requested by a user. Claimed computerized invention upon receiving a service request assigns a respective individual suitable for performing the requested building related task along with the time when the building related task needs to be performed; keeps track of the tasks; associates response received from the respective individual with the task; updates task record.

Inventions I, II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the

different inventions have different functions and effect, Group I directed to managing deliveries to and from occupants of a building; Group II directed to managing deliveries to and from occupants of a building; Group II directed to managing a building related task that is requested by a user.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and because the search required for Group I is not required for group II and because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 8-12 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention, see 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 98 – 100, 102 – 111, 113 – 118, 121 – 134 and 139 – 143 and 159 – 160 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara et al. Japanese Patent JP410229413A hereinafter known as Aihara.

Regarding claims 98, 109 and 159 – 160, Aihara teaches system and method and computer program for exchanging information among tenants. Aihara does not explicitly teaches exchanging information for a collaborative real estate management system for exchanging information among tenants and an individual associated with management of a building (type of a user). However, Aihara explicitly teaches using communication like email over the intranet. Also, it is old an known at the time of invention to one of ordinary skill in the art that building supervisor (aka super) associated with the real estate management who took care of tenant needs lived in the building as a tenant (at least in New York City). Tenants communicated with super for services like repairs associated with the apartment. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Aihara teachings of plurality of user devices from which one of the device can be given to an individual associated with management of a building (building super) and use electronic

exchange medium like internet, intranet, LAN etc. to electronically exchange information between the tenants and individual associated with the management of the building.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aihara and have one of the users be an individual associated with management of a building to allow the tenants to electronically communicate with the building management team.

Aihara in view of modification to Aiharea teaches:

a computer system in communication with data input and output devices accessible by said tenants and said individual associated with management of said building

computer system including one or more processors networked together and programmed to process data relating to management of said building;

said one or more processors programmed

i) to receive a communication relating to management of said building from a device associated with at least one of said tenants, said communication including data which can include information indicating an instruction being associated with a task performed by said individual, said individual being associated with a front desk of said building a front gate of said building or a combination thereof (applicant is claiming type of users for exchange of information and type of message generated by the tenant),

ii) to associate said instruction with said at least one of said tenants using an identifier (Aihara teaches email for communication, and, it is old and known that email header identifies the sender of the email, i.e. email is associated with the user)

iii) to store said instruction and said identifier on said computer system (emails are stored for later retrieval by a recipient at a later time)

iv) to enable said individual to search said computer system to obtain said instruction using a computing device associated with said individual (Aihara teaches a user can use their device to access information),

to enable interaction by tenants with individual, through the system.

Regarding claim 99, Aihara teaches to use a database (data storage means).

Regarding claim 100, Aihara storage means capable of storing data. Therefore, Aihara storage means can store data which includes a library of documents relating to said building which documents are accessible for viewing, storing, and editing by said tenants, a staff member, building manager, or any combination thereof (applicant is claiming type of data stored on a computer system as their invention)

Regarding claim 102, Aihara teaches capability to exchange communication with plurality of users. It is obvious that Aihara has capability to receive a communication relating to information regarding a service request among said tenants (applicant is claiming contents of an electronic message as their invention), a staff member, building manager (applicant is claiming type of user as their invention).

Regarding claims 103 – 104, as responded to earlier, Aihara teaches capability to receive a communication relating to package delivery and pickup information from a device associated with said individual (e.g. tenant calls front desk to inquire if the mail man has picked up today's mail, is there a package waiting for them, capability also found in hotels where a hotel guest contacts the business office for mail service).

Regarding claim 105, Aihara teaches capability to receive information posted by one of said tenants for viewing by other tenants of said building (e.g. list items for sale in the classifieds, print discount coupons from local merchants, and chat or play games in real time with other residents).

Regarding claim 106 – 108, as responded to earlier, Aihara storage means is capable of storing data like tenants, data relating to tasks, data relating to building maintenance programs.

Regarding claims 110, 113, as responded to earlier, Aihara is capable handling a message which includes instruction like permission to give access to a unit associated with a tenant, package delivery. (applicant is claiming content in a message as their invention, also, subject of the email can recite "package delivery" to notify recipient of tenant's intention of the email).

Regarding claim 111, Aihara teaches communication among tenants. Aihara teaches capability wherein unit number associated with the tenant can be used as a email id to identify the tenant.

Regarding claim 114, Aihara teaches using storage for storing data which the user want to store on the storage means for later retrieval (applicant is claiming type of data stored and key assigned to storing data in the storage means as their invention). Aihara teaches capability for:

storing information regarding pick-up, by said tenant, of said package (e.g. using the task function or calendar function of the tools provided with email packages like Microsoft Outlook)

associating said stored information with said instruction (e.g. email has associated information which teaches who originated the email).

Regarding claim 115, Aihara teaches capability for generated information which can contain notification associated with said instruction, and transmitting the transmitting said notification to said computing device associated with said tenant (e.g. deliver of email from building management to tenant).

Regarding claim 116, Aihara teaches capability for transmitting data representing portion of first instruction.

Regarding claim 117, as responded to earlier, Aihara devices can be placed in public area like entranceway associated with a building, an elevator associated with a building, another public area associated with a building etc.

Regarding claim 118, as responded to earlier, Aihara teaches capability for displaying data representing portion of first instruction (applicant is claiming content of information on a display screen as their invention).

Regarding claim 121, Aihara teaches using LAN/intranet to interconnect plurality of user devices. It is old an known that an apartment complex can have plurality of buildings. Therefore, Aihara teaches capability for providing aggregated data for said first building and a second building (intranet, plurality of buildings).

Regarding claim 122, as responded to earlier, Aihara teaches capability wherein tenant is a first tenant and individual is a first individual (users of Aihara), support for:

- receiving a request for service via a computing device associated with a second tenant associated with said building (recipient receiving email from a tenant);
- storing said request for service on said central computer (has been responded to earlier, storing of email in storage for later retrieval by the recipient); and
- enabling a second individual to search said central computer to obtain said request for service using a computing device (enabling recipient to be able to access the email).

Regarding claim 123, Aihara teaches capability to support user wherein first individual is identical to said second individual (applicant is claiming type of users as their invention).

Regarding claim 124, as responded to earlier, Aihara teaches communication between plurality of users over a LAN. Aihara is capability for providing aggregated data for said first and second buildings, said data comprising said request for service and another request for service associated with said second building.

Regarding claim 125, as responded to earlier, Aihara teaches capability to handle message which comprises an email address.

Regarding claim 126, as responded to earlier, Aihara has capability for enabling a user to search said central computer to obtain a list of search results including said request for service (e.g. unopened emails, sort emails by header, sender, date etc. to assist in searching).

Regarding claim 127, as responded to earlier, Aihara teaches exchange of emails among users. It is old and known that users can sort email (e.g. Lotus Notes, Microsoft Outlook etc.). Therefore, Aihara teaches capability for enabling users to sort list of search results status.

Regarding claim 128, Aihara teaches capability for enabling a user associated with building management to modify request for service (e.g. user responding to the email).

Regarding claim 129, Aihara teaches capability for allowing users to modify (forwarding the message) request for service which can comprise posting a comment to said request log etc. (applicant is claiming content of a message as their invention).

Regarding claim 130, Aihara teaches capability for transmitting a notification in response to said request for service (transmitting of email).

Regarding claim 131, Aihara teaches capability for transmitting an email.

Regarding claim 132, Aihara teaches capability for permitting access to information stored on said central computer based on a type of user (e.g. authorized user like a tenant; applicant is claiming type of user as their invention).

Regarding claims 133 – 134 and 139, Aihara teaches capability for supporting different type of users (applicant is claiming limiting use of invention to particular type of users as their invention).

Regarding claims 140 – 143, Aihara teaches capability for transmitting information like acknowledgements to users (e.g. email acknowledgment message).

Regarding claim 160, as responded to earlier in response to claim 109, Aihara teaches a collaborative real estate management system for exchanging information among tenants and an individual associated with management of a building (responded to response to claim 109), comprising:

a computer system in communication with data input and output devices accessible by said tenants and said individual (responded to response to claim 109), the computer system comprising:

a means for receiving an instruction from one or more of said devices associated with a first tenant associated with said building, said instruction being associated with a task performed by said individual, wherein said individual is associated with a front desk of said building, a front gate of said building etc. (responded to response to claim 109);

a means for associating said instruction with said first tenant using an identifier (inherent with an email, responded to response to earlier);

a means for storing said instruction and said identifier on a central computer (responded to response to claim 109); and

a means for enabling said individual to search said central computer to obtain said instruction using one or more of said devices associated with said individual (responded to response to claim 109).

Claim 112 and 136 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara et al. Japanese Patent JP410229413A hereinafter known as Aihara in view of Abe Japan Patent JP 08097850.

Regarding claims 112 and 136, Aihara does not teach designating said instruction as being inactive upon expiration of a specified time period. However, Abe teaches designating said instruction as being inactive upon expiration of a specified time period.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt teaching of Abe and modify Aihara to monitor whether the opening of the sent messages by the recipient.

Claim 119 and 120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara et al. Japanese Patent JP410229413A hereinafter known as Aihara in view of Strait et al. US Patent 6,038,315 hereinafter known as Strait.

Regarding claim 119, Aihara does not teach receiving biometric data. However, Strait teaches receiving biometric data for secure remote verification of users.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt the teaching of Strait and modify Aihara to provide alternate means for identifying users.

Regarding claim 120, Aihara in view of Strait teaches capability for comparing said received biometric data with biometric data stored on said central computer [Strait Fig. 2 and disclosure with Fig. 2].

Claim 135, 137, 138 and 144 – 156 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara et al. Japanese Patent JP410229413A hereinafter known as Aihara in view of Yahoo.com.

Regarding claim 135, Aihara teaches capability for providing bulletin board. Aihara does not teach an electronic library including one or more electronic documents. However, Yahoo teaches electronic library including one or more electronic documents.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt the teachings of Yahoo and modify Aihara to provide remoter access of building related documents to tenants.

Regarding claim 144, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability for enabling a user to search said electronic library using a keyword.

Regarding claim 145, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability for allowing access to said electronic library by users associated with said first building and users associated with a second building (users from plurality of locations).

Claim 146, as responded to earlier in response to claim 122, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability for:

receiving a request for service via a computing device associated with a second tenant associated with said building;

storing said request for service on said central computer;

enabling a second individual to search said central computer to obtain said request for service using a computing device; and

providing an electronic library including one or more electronic documents.

Regarding claim 147, as responded to earlier in response to claim 121, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability for providing aggregated data for said first and second buildings.

Regarding claim 148, as responded to earlier, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability for message to comprise an email address (e.g. header of an email).

Regarding claim 149, as responded to earlier, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability for transmitting a notification.

Regarding claim 150, as responded to earlier, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability for transmitting an email message.

Regarding claims, 137, 138 and 151, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability for associating permissions with an electronic document in said electronic library, said permissions defining which users can access, view, update etc. the electronic document. For example, search over the internet from Yahoo.com allows users only view the content, but does not allow the users to update the content. Another example is controlled access bulletin boards, chat rooms etc., corporation bulletin boards which can provide company rules and regulation documents online which can be read by employees but updated or replaced by authorized users only.

Regarding claim 152, as responded to earlier, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability to transmit a notification in response to an electronic document (e.g. email).

Regarding claim 153, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability for permitting access to information stored on said central computer based on a type of user (e.g. authorized user like a tenant; applicant is claiming type of user as their invention).

Regarding claim 154, as responded to earlier. Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability of handling message with instruction associated with package delivery.

Regarding claim 155, as responded to earlier, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability for transmitting data representing portion of said first instruction to a public display.

Regarding claim 156, as responded to earlier, Aihara in view of Yahoo teaches capability wherein public display comprises a display which can be placed in an entranceway associated with said building.

Claims 157 and 158 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara et al. Japanese Patent JP410229413A hereinafter known as Aihara in view of Yahoo.com and further in view of Strait et al. US Patent 6,038,315 hereinafter known as Strait.

Regarding claim 157, Aihara in view of Yahoo does not teach receiving biometric data. However, Strait teaches receiving biometric data for secure remote verification of users.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time of invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to adopt the teaching of Strait and modify Aihara in view of Yahoo to provide alternate means for identifying users.

Regarding claim 158, Aihara in view Yahoo and Strait teaches capability for comparing said received biometric data with biometric data stored on said central computer [Strait Fig. 2 and disclosure with Fig. 2].

Conclusion

Applicant is required under 37 CFR '1.111 (c) to consider the references fully when responding to this office action

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NARESH VIG whose telephone number is (571)272-6810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 7:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Naresh Vig/
Primary Examiner,
Art Unit 3629